



August 7, 1999

Theodore J. Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

Thank you for your letter with the correction on the telephone conversation with Mello. He called a few days ago to tell me that you had sent a letter to the Dean of Vermont Law School. He tried to make light of it, and I think he was also trying to find out if I had received a similar package. I left him unrelieved in what must be a source of anxiety for him. Life is much easier when one conducts his or her affairs with integrity, and an understanding of basic decency. I suppose some people never learn this very simple lesson. I recently revisited your letter to me of November 19, 1999. You pegged Mello there with regard to his conflicting feelings about you, his addiction to inaccurate media sources (which morphed into an addiction to media appearances!), and his chronic sloppiness.


I had a long conversation with the Talk Magazine editor who is working on the article entitled "The Price of Morality." Here's what I learned: The article will portray you as a person guided by his own strict moral principles. It will make clear that you developed your own code of values and beliefs, and that they form a cogent system. It will then show how David once subscribed to a similar moral position. Dubner had a momentary lapse of journalistic integrity and told me one quote from Linda Patrik that will be in the article: "I think I should have gotten more credit from the media for Ted's capture." (Although I know we should wait to see what he actually writes, this seems like a triumph and I feel like doing a touchdown polka!)

Dubner's focus is on the relationship between you and your brother and how morality played a role in decisions you each made. It seems to me that the writer will be handling the subject of morality in an abstract manner. He plans to expose David's earlier radicalism and his journey toward an establishment mind set. I expect Dubner to approach the work in an intellectual manner and that he will produce a thoughtful treatment of his subject matter. Finally, the editor told me that David has been recalcitrant during the interviews with Dubner, and Dubner is looking forward to talking to you. This might suggest that were you to be open and forthcoming with him, he would rely on your information.

I have now had the chance to hear parts of your interview with ' Unfortunately, much of the material is very difficult to hear without a sophisticated hi-fi system because the microphone

was not situated correctly, which produced a lot of background noise and echo. There is, however, a section that is clear. Let me tell you that ^{she} had a very emotional response to it. Contrary to the evaluation of your skills as an extemporaneous speaker, we all found you to possess a lively, compelling voice. It was a pleasure to hear you talk. I should explain that ^{her} response had much to do with the fact that she feels close to you, since I often talk about you. She has heard many of the trials and tribulations that have occurred during our correspondence. I too had a strong response, particularly when you were talking about your estrangement from nature. I am looking forward to our meeting.

This all goes toward supporting my feeling that you would be an excellent interview subject. Now, I need to tell you what else I found out from this editor. Apparently, the Editor-in-Chief is serious about being the first one to tell the story of your brother's motivations and the roles played by his relationships with you and Linda Patrik. She may kill the story if someone reports about the chronically bad dynamics between you and your family before she does. They know that 60 Minutes is also interested in an interview. I spoke to Gordon about this, and she has agreed to run the story whenever it is in your best interest. I trust her, pretty much*, but think there's an easy way to accommodate the demands of both Talk Magazine and 60 Minutes with little ado. Talk wants to break the story about your brother's wishy-washy morals. Fine. Their story will come out on the newsstands October 7. This is of course most likely before your book will be ready. This is a shame, since the article will create a larger group of readers willing to hear your rebuttal (and buy the book). Once we get the final paraphrase and summary from you the book will take about four weeks to get into stores. See below for what remains to be done.

The editor also told me that they would like to run an excerpt of *Truth versus Lies*. My opinion with regard to the kind of article they would like to run is largely based on the chapter they want: Chapter XV. Of course, this is the chapter that has a lot of letters. I told her that the letters will  have to be paraphrased. She still wants it. As publisher, I have decided that the Reagan reference stands as is (i.e., must be cited verbatim). Further, Korzenik thinks that such brief, relevant quotes are definitely acceptable (which should help you make decisions about the manner in which you paraphrase the copyrighted material). If there is any real problem here, it is my risk, and it is a necessary one. With Chapter XV placed before the article in the magazine, the public will be able to decide for themselves whether your brother's motivations were questionable.

Since this article represents a turning of the tide with regard to press coverage, it should, in my opinion, be accommodated. I'd recommend that you give Dubner an interview (and I will drop everything to be there!). I'd also recommend that if you are interested in 60 Minutes as the venue for a televised interview, that it takes place after the article is published, since the Editor-in-Chief is very impetuous and may kill the story if they are not first. The solution would be to hold off on telling your story to the media until the article comes out, which would include 60 Minutes and any other media agency (this is really important, and I think also worth doing). Since we know what Talk is going to run, it seems ludicrous to botch a supportive piece of journalism by

* I agree that it would be risky to trust them beyond the lukewarm "pretty much" which is synonymous with "not entirely." But there is more to tell on that score.

allowing something to occur that might be less than advantageous to your interests. My opinion about the article is that it will be important: I think Dubner is on a par with

I told that they would have to play second fiddle to Talk Magazine in the event you were willing to accommodate their request, and she made a very interesting suggestion worth mentioning. She wants to redress the error of reading your letters to David and Wanda aloud on the program by reading *David's* letters to you aloud on the program. This would mean that the information that we have to paraphrase for copyright reasons *will* come out whole and unedited. She said that CBS would be willing to absorb the lawsuit if David decided to sue. This is all new to me, so I may be missing something to which you will object. But right now it all seems very advantageous to the achievement of your immediate goals with regard to family matters and the media portrayal of you.

A word about timing: I spoke to Mike Wallace's producer on Friday (it is now Saturday). He was accommodating to the demands of timing as I now see things unfolding. I learned one important thing: they would prefer a week to edit your interview, but they can do it in three days. This has put me in mind of strategy. Were you to agree to an interview, I would like to find out when they would like to schedule it. We then put off the interview until the week of the ~~interview~~. For instance, they come out to tape the interview on Oct 5-6 and air the interview on October 10. It leaves them precious little time for funny business were they to have that in mind and therefore lessens the potential risks of doing an interview with them. Having said this, 60 Minutes wants the most explosive news story possible. The most explosive news story would indeed be that David Kaczynski, who has gone on from turning his brother into the FBI to becoming a media celebrity, is actually a wishy-washy sell-out radical who turned in his brother for highly ambiguous reasons. With all of the above in mind, I hope you will agree to meet with the 60 Minutes people for an off-the-record meeting. I am personally excited to be coming out at last for a visit, which would be at least two days as it stands.

schedule
program

Miller has accepted "Solution A" with regard to (Dubner interviewed and will comment on the meaning of David's opinions regarding schizophrenia. He was fascinated by the information from your book on that score.) There are no more libel or defamation issues. The only thing that remains is the letters and quotes that you will be paraphrasing. I have spoken to Korzenik about the privilege issue and your defense work-product. He told me that we "probably" have already cleared most of the legal issues by other means. I do not know if this is the case and will find out when Miller comes in on Monday (it is 7 pm, Friday). Perhaps this actually is the case, since I have held corroborating interviews with your (at some length), Scharlette Holdman, , Quin Denvir, Eileen undberg, , Steven Dubner (his interviewing of , etc.), and I suppose others that are not coming to mind just now but are in my notes. He did tell me that privileged material would be useless to me were someone to file suit. By definition, I cannot use privileged information in my defense. It would be helpful if you could make a provision for me per Korzenik's suggestion: Would it be possible to make the privileged work-product available to me after it no longer has bearing on

* but not necessary

your case (i.e., after all legal avenues have been exhausted or successfully implemented)? This would be helpful were someone to file suit against us. Apparently such a provision would allow us to delay a trial on any actions until the privilege was waived in my favor so that it can be used as supporting evidence. Please let me know if this would be possible.

With regard to the drawing of your dorm room in Eliot House, I would like to use your original drawing. Let me know if you would prefer a professional rendition.

may be sending you a photograph of me. She took one of me at my desk. I was wearing pink wool hat replete with a pom-pom. I do not apologize! Here's the story: I loved a girl named when I was a freshman in college and she gave it to me under the strict order that I never lose it. is still an acquaintance (she's a librarian in Vermont) and I still have the hat. I wear it every Wednesday, sometimes for just a moment and sometimes all day (but mostly only Wednesdays, although I *am* wearing it now). I confess that it may be deemed a peculiarity. Alas. But I take pride in the fact that I have thus far successfully followed her instructions. Wearing it regularly is a way to make sure that I do not lose it.

Just talked to . She is doing just fine, and says "Hello!" One thing that still occupies her time, however, is her communications with Theresa. I had put some of this down to female competition. But I think it may go somewhat beyond that. I have suggested to that she relate what she told me in a detailed manner to you, since it does not all tally with the manner in which I would report information received from . First, you know that I like who also likes her, told me the following: " trusts you [me] and Ted when it comes to what she should do with the interviews. She trusts Derrick and John Zerzan in a more or less general way. She did not mention

told me that you were perplexed at reaction to your suggestion that go along for the ride to corroborate the interview material. You will want to know that was very interested in having *me* come along, but I couldn't because of my responsibilities here at the time. I suggested that she bring . She reacted oddly, saying, in effect, that it would be strange to go with her. I did not push the matter, and put it down to female issues. told me today that spent a good long time telling her that she was your most trusted ally. Why would she not want your most trusted ally to accompany her to the interview? This seems out of tune with what one would imagine the overall tenor should be. On a less important point, that she was going to Wales to avoid the media. She told me that she was going to look into a Ph.D. program at the University of Wales, and to study her family's genealogy for a relative (an aunt, I think) and also to get away from the media. Earlier, when the *Gear* article came out, she mentioned to me something about becoming the national spokesperson for the Unabomber. Also: She expressed the opinion that because she had met with you, your family would want to meet with her. She said nothing of this to me, but I can imagine that it may have something to do with an interview regarding the alleged shutdowns. I leave it there as information.

I will be writing the preface we discussed soon. In answer to your question, you *are* the most honest person I have ever encountered. I hold you up as a model after which I fashion my own behavior when it comes to the way in which I talk to people and relate information. I aspire to be in a position where nothing I have written or said is such that I wouldn't acknowledge it to anyone who might find occasion to ask me about it. This can be uncomfortable at times, but it makes life easier. This stance led me to articulate to Theresa my ideological position as based on what I call the truth. It can be boiled down to what is, for simplicity's sake, best termed the honest truth, and it's pretty simple. First of all, we know that we will die some day. We also know that we need certain things to survive. We *also* know that there are many things that, in all "honesty," we do not need, including an abnormally long life. Being honest is part of being truthful, but being truthful does not require honesty*. Does this make sense? Having gone this far, and realizing that I should get this off to you before the post office closes, I will say that you are also the most truthful person I have met thus far. The honest truth requires certain actions by the people who hold something to be true. It is the wellspring of activism, in my opinion, whether it takes the form of publishing or guerilla pragmatism.

I hope this letter finds you well (and apologize for its length), knowing full well that it must find you terribly busy.

Yours,

Dean.

* This needs further thought. It's not exact.